

REMARKS

Responsive to the outstanding Office Action, applicant has carefully studied the Examiner's rejections and the comments relative thereto. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and following detailed arguments.

In this response, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10 and 12 -13 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been presented in this amendment.

INDICATION OF ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 3-10 were indicated as being allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims, and to correct the informalities noted herein.

In response thereto, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of previously pending claims 2 and 3. It is therefore believed that this amended claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-15 were objected to by the Examiner for containing numerous informalities. The Examiner made several specific objections to claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 12 and 14.

In response thereto, applicant has amended the claims and makes the following comments relative to the amendments.

The Examiner objected to claim 1 as not referring to the mass flow signal. Therefore, the text of the preamble has been amended to indicate that both mass flow and energy flow signals can be accommodated.

The Examiner indicated that "the unit" in claim 3 had no antecedent basis. Therefore clause "e" in claim 1, which was previously clause "a" of claim 3, has been amended to indicate that the thermal flow sensor provides the function of the gas quality sensor which is believed to overcome this antecedent basis issue.

The Examiner indicated that claim 4 was unclear as to what the tolerance refers. In response thereto, claim 4 has been amended to apply to each of the gases.

In claim 7, the Examiner indicates that it was not clear what was stored intermediately and used as a start value. The claim has been amended in a manner believed to clarify this issue.

In claim 12, the Examiner has indicated that it is not clear how the gas quality sensor generates the discrimination signal. Therefore, the claim has been amended to indicate that the discrimination signal is generated as a function of a gas-dependent parameter.

The Examiner notes that claim 14 appears to indicate 2 sensors. The claim has been amended to clarify that the thermal flow sensor functions as the gas quality sensor in a) and that, in b), the thermal flow sensor is disposed in a region with a constant flow rate.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102 and 103


The Examiner has made several rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103. However, previously pending claim 3 and independent claim 12 were not rejected over any art. Therefore, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of previously pending claims 1 and 2. It is therefore believed that all of the claim rejections are moot and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

In view of the above, it is believed that independent claims 1 and 12 are in condition for allowance. The remainder of the claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of these claims and are thus also believed to be in condition for allowance. Action towards that end is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner wish to modify the application in any way, applicant's attorney suggests a telephone interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Hixon
Registration No. 44,766

ATTORNEYS
Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate - 8th Floor
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 249-7114
(419) 249-7151 Facsimile
HIXON@MARSHALL-MELHORN.COM